

REMARKS

Claims 18 and 24-30 are currently pending. Claims 1-17 and 19-23 have been canceled. Claim 18 has been amended. Support for the amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification and original claims, for example, at page 8, line 3 and original claims 2-9. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner has required restriction and election of one of Groups I-VII as set out in the Office Action. Applicant affirms the election of Group V, drawn to claim 18, without traverse. Claims 18 and 24-30 read on the elected invention.

Applicant respectfully requests that the IDS submitted concurrently with this response be considered.

Claim 18 is objected to for being dependent on a non-elected claim. Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of the objection because the claim has now been amended to be an independent claim.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office Action asserts that the specification does not teach a common structure of polypeptides of the invention. Applicants have amended the claims to recite that the PDZ domain has at least 50% homology to the PDZ domain of hCASK (SEQ ID NO: 2). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 18 further stands rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that it is unclear how the presence of a disease in a sample can be detected. Applicants respectfully point to page 22, line 14 to page 23, line 2 of the specification where a description of Methods of Detection of the invention is provided. The specification indicates that the sample being used in the detection method is derived from an organism capable of having a disease, and that the sample would be likely to contain a target indicative of the disease, if the disease were present in the organism. One skilled in the art would understand from this disclosure that a disease can be detected in a sample because the sample is derived from a potentially diseased organism and, thus, potentially contains a detectable target associated with the disease. Accordingly, the claim is clear and definite within

the patent laws, and Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 18 is further rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by Junqueira et al. (Oncogene, 2003, vol. 22, pp 2772-2781) and under 35 USC 102(c) as being anticipated by Lu et al. (US 2004/0018487). Applicant believes the amendments render the rejection moot because the prior art references fail to teach each and every limitation of the amended claims, particularly a PDZ domain having at least 50% homology with the hCASK PDZ domain. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Please apply the fee of \$525 for the Petition for Extension of Time and any other charges to our deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 26, 2008

/Christine A. Goddard/
Christine A. Goddard, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 46,731

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945